



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP

BY PROFESSOR EMORY R. JOHNSON,
University of Pennsylvania.

The position of the United States on the American continent is one of leadership, with all the responsibilities and perplexing duties involved in that position. The question of who should lead in the affairs of the American continents was practically settled in 1763, when the power of France in North America was broken by the British colonies, aided by the home government in Great Britain. The American revolution did not decide whether the American colonies or Great Britain should lead in American affairs, but rather whether the colonies should bear the burden of leadership alone or with the aid of an European country. We chose in favor of undivided responsibility, but we were comparatively slow in realizing the scope of the obligation we assumed. It took the trouble with France at the close of the eighteenth century, the war of 1812, the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine against the designs of the Holy Alliance, the maintenance of the rights of Mexico against France, the Venezuelan boundary dispute, the Spanish War and many other events in our international relations to make us fully conscious of our leadership and our responsibilities as the great power on the American continent.

This leadership is threefold—economic, political and educational; and it would be difficult to decide which of these three phases of our responsibilities is the most important.

Our economic leadership is the most recent. A few years since we were a debtor nation, largely dependent upon the aid of outsiders for the development of our own country. Our foreign trade consisted chiefly of the exportation of food and raw materials in exchange for manufactures. This situation is changing. We have surplus capital; and although we are continuing to export great quantities of raw cotton, provisions and forest products, we are

buying fewer manufactures and more materials, and are exporting increasing values of our own manufactures. Our capital is developing Mexico and Hawaii, and is being invested largely in the West Indies, the countries about the Caribbean, in Canada, and in the Philippines. Our manufacturers and exporters are steadily entering the foreign markets. There are but few sections north of the American Isthmus—and they are of but limited area—where the economic interests of the people of the United States are not paramount to those of any European country.

In South America, Europe is stronger than the United States commercially; but that is certain to be changed throughout the western third of the continent by the Panama Canal. With or without the canal we shall in time control the major share of the trade of the Caribbean section of South America, but the canal will exert indirect influences that will hasten our economic progress even along the north shore of South America.

Our ultimate economic leadership on the American continents is assured. How is this to affect our economic policy? It can hardly fail to compel us to modify our tariff policy. We shall be compelled to shape our legislation concerning commerce less exclusively with reference solely to domestic conditions, and more with regard to our economic relations with the other countries of North and South America. We may, and probably shall, continue our policy of protection; but by reciprocity or some other more promising measure yet to be discovered we shall work toward a policy of protecting both our home manufactures and our American international trade. We shall hear less of the question of protection or free trade, and more of the question of protection and trade.

This broadening of our commercial policy will be forced upon us not only by our own economic interest, but as a result of our responsibilities as the leader in the affairs of the American continents. We have already recognized this duty in our relations with Cuba. We had to struggle not a little with our national selfishness, but after considering our duties carefully we recognized the fact that our responsibility to Cuba involved such a change in our tariff as would enable that island to prosper. Economic prosperity was the prerequisite of the political progress for which we had become sponsor. I believe that what we did in shaping our relations with Cuba is an earnest of what we are destined to do from time to time in our

relations with many, if not most, countries of Latin America. We must couple economic and political leadership.

The political leadership of the United States in North and South America is an obligation which the United States cannot avoid, and the majority of the people of our country have no desire to avoid this obligation. This is what we mean by upholding the Monroe Doctrine, in which we believe so fully. But how little did we realize even two or three decades since what the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine implies! We knew in a general way that our Monroe Doctrine meant that we should uphold republican institutions against European interference in the countries south of us. This would, indeed, not be a difficult problem for us if the countries of Latin America possessed stable and efficient governments by which the property and personal rights of citizens and foreign residents were safeguarded by liberal laws impartially executed. But this result has not been accomplished by many of the republics of Latin America. We must acknowledge that our hopes regarding the success of republican institutions in Spanish America were raised too high.

Five years ago this month I returned from a three months' trip to Central America and the Isthmus. On that trip I saw something of the government of Nicaragua, where the President of the country had two years before succeeded himself in office contrary to the provisions of the constitution. He is now serving a third term without retirement. In Costa Rica the genial President of the country had succeeded himself in office, the Congress having suspended the clause of the constitution prohibiting a man from being President two terms in succession. At the end of the second term this President was reluctantly persuaded to permit some one else to be elected; but even then there was rioting and uncertainty as to the issue during the day upon which the new President was inaugurated. In Colombia five years ago a prolonged and bloody revolution was in progress. The Isthmus of Panama was then quiet enough. It has since been somewhat active politically, with results mutually advantageous to the people of Panama and to the United States.

I have referred to this trip to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama, not because it was exceptional, but because it gave me, as I believe it would have given any American visiting Central America and northern South America for the first time, a realization of

the instability and uncertainty of republican institutions in those countries.

Republican institutions are not working as they ought to in many countries of Latin America, and we cannot avoid responsibility for the correction of at least some of the wrongdoings of those countries. When we asserted the Monroe Doctrine we thought all republics would always do right; now we find they may do wrong, and when they do a wrong to an European country or a citizen of an European country we are practically compelled to require justice to be done. Our Monroe Doctrine requires us to compel European countries to refrain from interfering in the administration of the republics of Latin America, but the time has come when we must either assume large responsibilities as regards Latin America or allow Europe greater freedom in dealing with her international relations with Central and South America. There is so much European capital invested in those countries and there are so many Europeans engaged in business there that Europe will not tolerate political conditions that do not afford protection to personal and property rights. Unless we permit Europe to protect her interests in South America, she will hold us responsible for that protection. Indeed, this position has already been taken by European countries, and we are coming to realize, as never before, the responsibilities we assumed when we made the Monroe Doctrine the basis of our international position on the American continents.

Our leadership in the affairs of Latin America is educational as well as economic and political. Fifty years ago the people of Latin America were influenced mainly by the culture and educational ideals of Spain and France. This has changed, and to-day the people of Mexico and Central America, and to an increasing extent the people of the countries of South America, are coming under the influence of American culture. On the trip which I took to Central America and the Isthmus five years ago I was met in nearly every city visited by men who had studied in the United States, usually in New York or in Philadelphia. The ambitious young men of Latin America are coming to this country in increasing numbers to pursue courses in medicine, surgery, in political science and diplomacy, and in the higher branches of commerce and finance. This is the most hopeful phase of our relations with Latin America. Having assumed responsibility for the economic and political progress of the countries

to the south of us, we may well welcome these evidences of our growing educational and cultural influences upon the people of Latin America. It is absolutely essential that we should understand their civilization. The presence in our midst of a large body of students from Latin America will result not only in their obtaining a better understanding of our civilization, but will also assist us to a knowledge of Latin American institutions. We in this country are proverbially provincial and are prone to think that institutions that work well in this country will work well in all places, and under all conditions. There could be no greater fallacy. Successful institutions are those which harmonize with the spirit and with the ideals of the people. Without doubt the political institutions of the United States can be so adapted as to harmonize with the racial and social conditions obtaining in the countries of Latin America; but it is equally certain that our institutions cannot be successfully transplanted. The efforts to transplant our constitution to the soil of Latin America have resulted in many lamentable failures. Political chaos and the despotism of the dictator have been possible in countries whose constitutions provided for liberty in an ideal manner.

Every effort should be made by such organizations as the American Academy of Political and Social Science; by the University of Pennsylvania and other great educational institutions of the country, by the Carnegie Institution, and by the wealthy benefactors of education to provide for the systematic study by American scholars of the economic and political conditions and the legal institutions prevailing in Latin America. If we are to exercise our leadership wisely and intelligently, American scholars must tell us what to do. It is, moreover, hardly less important for us to encourage in every way possible the presence in our educational institutions of an increasing number of young men from all parts of Latin America. In this way and by these means alone can we look forward confidently to a successful and beneficent leadership of the United States in the affairs of the American continents.